

REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel pressure-sensitive adhesive article.

Claims 1-11 are pending, although claims 3 and 7 have been withdrawn as directed to a non-elected invention. The claims under examination are therefore claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-11.

Applicants respectfully request that, upon the allowance of claims drawn to elected subject matter, the non-elected claims be rejoined.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that polymer blocks P(A) and P(B) are immiscible. Support can be found at page 7, line 20.

Claim 10 stands objected to because the Examiner reads the claim as requiring a primer on the side of the support opposite the side bearing the adhesive coating. The claim has now been amended to more clearly recite that when the backing is only partially coated with an adhesive, it is also partly coated with the primer. The primer is “opposite” the adhesive, meaning that the coating pattern of the primer corresponds to that of the adhesive and the “partial coating” of adhesive will match up with the “partial coating” of primer.

It is believed that the amendments to claim 10 clarify the foregoing meaning, and the objection to claim 10 should now be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the Examiner reads the claims as requiring a primer on the side of the backing opposite the side having the adhesive coating. The claims have now been amended to more clearly recite that the backing is only partly coated with an adhesive, and that the primer is applied “opposite” the adhesive, i.e., meaning on the same side of the backing and in the same pattern so that it is “opposite” the adhesive.

It is believed that the foregoing clarifies the meaning of the claims and that the clarified claims are clearly supported by the specification. The rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph should now be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as the Examiner does not see where the orientation recited in the claim is supported in the specification. The language found on page 9, line 30 through page 10, line 13, clearly conveys to those skilled in the art that the adhesive is oriented and provides support for claim 9. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the terms “hard” and “soft” are reversed with respect to the recited

T_g temperature ranges disclosed in the specification. The specification stands objected to for the same reasons.

Both the specification and the claims have now been amended to associate the terms “hard” and “soft” with the appropriate T_g temperature ranges. This does not introduce any new matter, as the mis-application of the terms in the original specification and claims was clearly in error and the originally-recited T_g ranges themselves define the hard/soft relationship.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and the objection to the specification should therefore both now be withdrawn.

Turning now to the art rejection, claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by JP 10-025460 machine translation. The Examiner indicates that the terms “hard” and “soft” and their associated T_g ranges have not been considered in making this rejection due to the error in associating the terms with the incorrect T_g ranges in the original specification and claims. The error regarding these terms has now been corrected, and the terms “hard,” “soft” and the associated T_g ranges should now be considered.

In addition, the fact that Applicants’ polymer blocks P(A) and P(B) are immiscible should also be considered.

Neither of these two limitations are taught or suggested by the JP reference.

Applicants' adhesives possess a very special property, which is neither taught or suggested by the JP reference.

The adhesives used in Applicants' self-adhesive articles generate an organizational structure in which the hard domains form small regions which are adhesion free, or virtually so, and the soft domains give rise to very small adhesive regions (page 3, lines 13-29). This results in the relatively low bond strength and redetachability needed for sticky notes.

Nothing in the JP reference teaches or suggests this.

Moreover, the JP reference would, if anything, teach away from it. Paragraph [0010] of the reference plainly discloses that the object of the reference is to provide an acrylic binder that has excellent adhesiveness. This is exactly the opposite of the requirements for Applicants' adhesive, which must have a low bond strength.

Accordingly, the JP reference neither anticipates nor suggests Applicants' claims, and the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by JP 10-025460 machine translation should now be withdrawn.

In view of the present amendments and remarks it is believed that claims 1-11 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Applicant requests that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS

By /William C. Gerstenzang/
William C. Gerstenzang
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmo

875 Third Avenue- 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 808-0700